

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. By this Amendment, all pending claims have been amended. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claim 8 has been objected to for the informalities identified at page 2 of the Office Action. To overcome this objection, Applicants have amended claim 8 as shown above. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action has indicated that claim 4's recitation that "the allocated logical channel **before** a transfer of the data" is not supported by the original disclosure. Applicant's respectfully disagree with the rationale for rejecting claim 4 under § 112.

In particular, page 3, lines 5-10 of the specification provide that a logical channel may be allocated after or at the same time that an address is transferred in the multiplex mode. As is explained in detail, the transmitted address is used to solicit the reception station 3 for data communication. Once the reception station is solicited, data can be communicated via data bus 1. Moreover, the specification makes it clear that a logical channel of control bus 4 can be allocated such that the reception station 3 does not need to be solicited using an address for each subsequent time that data is to be communicated to and from the control station 2.

Accordingly, one of skill in the art would understand that a logical channel of control bus 4 can be allocated before, at the same time, or after data is transferred via data bus 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 stands incorrectly rejected under § 112. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claims 6-11 stand rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. To overcome the rejection of these claims under § 112, Applicants have amended claim 6 as shown above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Moreover, the rejection of claims 7-11, which depend either directly or indirectly on claim 6, should also be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Landez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,124,983; hereinafter “Landez”).¹ Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as follows.

As justification for the rejection of independent claims 1, 2 and 5, the Office Action cites Figure 1 of Landez and identifies Landez’s resource manager 2 for the claimed “control station”, station A or B for the claimed “reception station”, data bus 1 for the claimed “data bus” and arbitration bus 4 as the claimed “control bus”. However, claim 1 requires that the control station is coupled to the control bus. In contrast, Landez discloses the resource manager 2 is only connected to the data bus 1, but not to the arbitration bus 4. (See Fig. 1 of Landez.)

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Because Landez fails to disclose that the control station is coupled to the control bus, independent claims 1, 2 and 5 are not anticipated by Landez.

Applicants further note that Landez’s synchronization link 3 cannot be viewed as the claimed “control bus”. The only disclosure regarding the synchronization link 3 is provided at column 5, lines 29-32 of Landez. Specifically, the synchronization link 3 is used to

¹ Applicants note that while the Office Action only indicates claims 1-12 as being rejected under § 102(b), it is clear from the substance of the Office Action, that claim 13 is also rejected under § 102(b).

communicate the nominal access time slot of the station, which is communicated to it by the resource management controller 2. As such, the synchronization link 3 is not used to allocate a logical channel, but rather is used for transmitting the nominal access time slot of the station. Accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 5 remain novel over Landez for this additional reason.

Furthermore, the Office Action has cited column 2, lines 57-67 of Landez to justify the § 102(b) rejection of the independent claims. The cited portion provides “a control bus coupled to said control station and to said at least one reception station, wherein said control station is configured to allocate a logical channel, via said control bus, between said control station and said at least one reception station.”

As such, the cited portion discloses the allocation of nominal access time slots for data communication. As indicated in claim 1 of Landez, the transmission medium is time-shared between a plurality of stations in which information is transmitted in the respective time slots. In contrast, control bus 4 consists of logical channels that may be allocated to different reception stations 3. For example, if control bus 4 contains one line, then two logical channels can be allocated. (See page 6 of the specification.) One of skill in the art would not read Landez’s time slots on the “logical channels” required by claim 1. This is highlighted by the fact that multiple logical channels of control bus 4 can be allocated to different reception stations 3 at the same time. (See page 6 of the specification.)

Applicants note that the independent claims have been further amended to provide a data bus configured to operate in a data and address multiplex mode. (Emphasis added.) As such, the independent claims further clarify the type of multiplexing recited in the pending claims.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1, 2 and 5, along with their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Landez.

In addition, independent claims 2 and 5 recite that data is interchange between the control station and the reception station for as long as the logical channel of control bus 4 is allocated to the reception station. Again, the Office Action cites column 2, lines 57-67 of Landez for this feature. Landez is simply inapposite for this limitation. If the rejection of these claims is maintained based on the current rationale provided in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of how Landez reads on the explicitly recited features.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: February 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicants